

REMARKS

Claims 14, 16, 18 and 21-36 are pending. Claims 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27, 28, 30 and 31 have been amended. Claims 15, 17, 19 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 33-36 have been added. Claims 14 and 28 are independent.

Initially, applicants wish to point out that the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 9, 2008 contained typographical error with regard to German patent document DE 199 01 918, which was incorrectly listed as “DE 199 91 918.” It is noted that two counterpart U.S. patents were also cited on the same SB/08 form and clearly noted as being equivalents to the German document. Moreover, the Information Disclosure Statement was accompanied by a hard copy of the correct German document. So that the correct number can appear on the face of the issued patent in the present application, an SB/08 form is attached correctly listing the number of the previously-submitted German document. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial the SB/08 form.

The Office Action objected to the drawings on the grounds that reference numerals 5 and 6 were both used to refer to the same structure. This is not correct. As is discussed in the specification, reference numeral 5 is used to refer to an insulating layer/foil, while reference numeral 6 is used to refer to a metallization (planar conducting structure) that is formed over the insulating layer. See, e.g., the Substitute Specification at page 7, lines 7-11. Withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 15 was objected to as being dependent on a cancelled claim. Cancellation of claim 15 renders the objection moot.

Claims 14-21, 23-25 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,404,792 (Yamamoto et al.). Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yamamoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,479,930 (Tanabe et al.). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over

Yamamoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent 7,126,163 (Katoh). Applicants submit that the amended independent claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 14

Amended independent claim 14 recites, inter alia, that the optoelectronic component has a central light exit and/or entry and an edge contact, wherein a window is opened in the insulating layer in the area of the central light exit and/or entry of the optoelectronic component.

By virtue of the provision of the window in the insulating layer, an exit and/or entry of the radiation which is emitted, or should be detected, by the optoelectronic component is made possible. In particular, an interaction of light emitted or detected by the optoelectronic component with the environment is possible.

In contrast, Yamamoto does not disclose a window in the area of the central light exit and/or entry. Yamamoto discloses a device comprising a light-emitting diode 11 attached to a mount frame 35 having a pair of mount electrode pads 36, 37 (see col. 6, lines 45-47). The light-emitting diode 11 is covered by an insulating film 40, in particular a SiO₂ film, the insulating layer 40 being transparent to the light generated by the light-emitting diode 11 (see, e.g., Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 4-7).

With respect to the feature of amended claim 14 that a window is opened in the insulating layer in the area of a light exit and/or entry opening of the optoelectronic component, the Office Action referred to Yamamoto's figures 4 and 30, in its rejection of the dependent claims that previously recited this feature. In particular, the position was taken in the Office Action that the openings which form an electrical connection to the chips correspond to the abovementioned limitation. This is not correct.

While the insulating layer of Yamamoto does have openings, as shown in Yamamoto's figures 4 and 30, the openings are to form a wiring connection between the light emitting diode 11

and the mount electrode pads 36, 37 of the mount frame 35. The central light exit and/or entry of Yamamoto's light emitting diode 11 *is the insulating layer*. However, the insulating layer of Yamamoto does not comprise a window opened in the area of the central light exit, as recited in amended independent claim 14. The insulating layer only has openings in the area of the edge contact of the light emitting diode 11.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed clear that the features of amended claim 14 that the optoelectronic component has *a central light exit and/or entry and an edge contact* disposed at least partially around a periphery of the light exit, wherein a window is opened in the insulating layer in the area of *the central light exit and/or entry* of the optoelectronic component, is not taught by Yamamoto.

Additionally, Yamamoto fails to provide any incentive to arrange a window in the area of the central light exit and/or entry. Specifically, Yamamoto refers to an insulating layer which is transparent to the light generated by the light-emitting diode (see col. 7, lines 4-7). Therefore, the problem to provide an exit and/or entry of the radiation which is emitted (or should be detected) by the light-emitting diode is *already solved by provision of the transparent insulating layer*. Consequently, there is no need for a window in the insulating layer in Yamamoto.

Thus, in view of Yamamoto transparent insulating layer, a person skilled in the art would not modify the device of Yamamoto to have a window in the insulating layer, in the area of the central light exit and/or entry opening of the light-emitted diode. There would be no reason to make such a modification.

The other cited documents are not believed to remedy the above mentioned deficiency of Yamamoto as a reference against amended claim 14.

Independent Claim 28

Amended claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, that the conducting structure at least partially covers the light exit and/or entry of the optoelectronic component wherein the conducting structure is reflective to guide light. By virtue of the reflective conductive structure, light is reflected back into the optoelectronic component until it exits at the light opening.

Yamamoto discloses a device comprising a light-emitting diode 11 covered by an insulating film 40 (see figure 4). Wiring layers 41, 42 are formed on the insulating film 40 (see col. 6, lines 52-53). However, light guidance by the conductive parts is not provided in Yamamoto. In particular, the wiring layers 41, 42 Yamamoto are not for guiding light.

Yamamoto also clearly fails to provide incentive to achieve a light guidance by means of the wiring layers 41, 42, or any reason why one would need to do so. Thus, a person skilled in the art would not have any reason to modify the device of Yamamoto such that wiring layers 41, 42 would have light guiding properties as claimed.

For the reasons given above, amended independent claims 14 and 28 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. With regard to the dependent claims, support for the feature of new claim 33 can be found in claim 22. Support for the feature of new claim 34 can be found in the last paragraph of page 3 of the substitute specification. Support for the feature of new claim 35 can be found in the first full paragraph of page 3 of the substitute specification. Support for the feature of new claim 36 can be found in paragraph 5 of page 6 of the substitute specification.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1633 Broadway
New York, New York 10019-6708
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant